## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

EUROPGOLD LTD.,

Plaintiff,

-against-

SILVER N GOLD WHOLESALE, LLC, ALPINE GOLD GROUP, INC. and PADAM VALIRAMANI a/k/a MIKE VALIRAMANI,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:24-cv-07297 (JLR)

## **ORDER**

JENNIFER L. ROCHON, United States District Judge:

On January 7, 2025, the Clerk of Court entered a certificate of default as to Defendant Alpine Gold Group after it failed to file an answer or otherwise respond to the Complaint. *See* Dkt. 22. On March 3, 2025, prior to proper service of the other two Defendants, *see* Dkts. 29-30, Plaintiff moved for default judgment as to Alpine Gold Group only. *See* Dkt. 27.

On April 24, 2025, after counsel for Defendants filed a letter with the Court indicating that Defendant Valiramani had been overseas and unreachable prior to that point, *see* Dkt. 39, the Court held a remote conference and extended all Defendants' answer deadlines to May 8, 2025, *see* Dkts. 38, 42. On May 9, 2025, Defendants Alpine Gold Group and Silver N Gold Wholesale filed an Answer. *See* Dkt. 43. However, contrary to representations made at the conference, counsel for Defendants did not coordinate the service of Defendant Valiramani, and Defendant Valiramani did not file an Answer. *See* Dkts. 45, 48. Counsel for Defendants has also not filed a notice of appearance as instructed by the Court. *See* Dkt. 42; *cf. Colburn Fam. Found. v. Chabad's Child. of Chernobyl*, 739 F. Supp. 2d 614, 620 (S.D.N.Y. 2010) ("[W]here a corporation repeatedly fails to appear by counsel, a default judgment may be entered against it pursuant to Rule 55." (quoting *Grace v. Bank Leumi Tr. Co. of N.Y.*, 443 F.3d 180, 192 (2d Cir. 2006))). On July 9, 2025, the Court granted Plaintiff's motion to serve

Defendant Valiramani by email, see Dkt. 49, and Plaintiff served Defendant Valiramani later

that day, see Dkt. 50. Accordingly, Defendant Valiramani's answer is now due on July 30,

2025. See id.

As all Defendants have now been served, and Alpine Gold Group has since filed an

Answer, it is hereby ORDERED that the motion for default judgment at Dkt. 27 is DENIED

as MOOT without prejudice to renewal as to all three Defendants at a later date if Defendant

Valiramani fails to respond to the Complaint and no appearance is entered on behalf of

Defendants. The Clerk of Court is respectfully directed to terminate the pending motion at

Dkt. 27.

Dated: July 17, 2025

New York, New York

SO ORDERED.

United States District Judge